

**REMARKS**

Amendments have been made to the Title, Abstract, and specification. Claims 1, 4, 9 - 13, 16, 21 - 25, 28, 34 - 37, 39, 42, and 47 have been amended. Claims 8, 20, 33, 38, and 46 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1 - 7, 9 - 19, 21 - 32, 34 - 37, 39 - 45, and 47 remain in the application.

**I. Objection to the Title**

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action dated August 4, 2004 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that the Title is objected to as not being descriptive. A revised Title is supplied herewith, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

**II. Objection to the Abstract**

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action states that the Abstract is objected to, and in particular, line 2 and lines 9 - 11 are considered problematic. Appropriate correction has been made herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

**III. Objection to the Specification**

Paragraph 9 of the Office Action states that the disclosure is objected to because of informalities, and in particular, text in the third paragraph of page 18 is considered problematic. Appropriate correction has been made herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

**IV. Objection to the Claims**

Paragraph 11 of the Office Action states that Claims 4, 6, 16, 18, 28, 30, 42, and 44 are objected to because of informalities, and in particular, the term "is used an" is considered problematic. Appropriate correction of this typographical error has been made herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

**V. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Paragraph 13 of the Office Action states that Claims 13 - 22, 24 - 35, and 37 - 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Patel et al ("An Efficient Discrete Log Pseudo Random Generator"). Applicant has amended his independent Claims 13, 25, and 39 herein, and believes that these independent claims, as amended, are patentable over the teachings of Patel. The dependent claims are therefore deemed patentable over the reference as well. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection.

**VI. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Paragraph 31 of the Office Action states that Claims 23 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel in view of Schneier ("Applied Cryptography"). Paragraphs 32 - 33 of the Office Action state that Claims 1 and 2 - 12, respectively, are also rejected using these references. Applicant has amended his dependent Claim 1, and believes that this claim, as amended, is patentable over the teachings of Patel. Dependent Claims 2 - 12 are therefore deemed patentable over the references as well. Dependent Claims 23 and 36 are deemed patentable by allowability of the amended independent claims from which they depend

(which were addressed above). The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

VII. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-933-2633

Serial No. 09/753,727

-19-

RSW920000091US1